

April 12, 2016

VIA EMAIL

jgwilson@cityofboise.org

Josh Wilson
Design Review Planner
BOISE CITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
150 N. Capitol Boulevard, 2nd Floor
Boise, Idaho 83702

Re: Staff Report for DRH16-00079

Dear Mr. Wilson,

We are in receipt of and have reviewed the Staff Report for DRH16-00079 regarding the development of the property commonly known as Parcel B. We are generally in agreement with the conditions of approval that have been set forth therein. As we discussed in our meeting on April 11, 2016, there are three general issues that we believe require additional comment and response before presentation to the Design Review Committee.

First, Site Specific Condition 1b requests a “prominent entrance to the Office Building on Myrtle Street.” We seek clarification for what is intended by this request. In our previous application DRH15-00339 we had extensive discussion with the committee on appropriate types of secured access directly to Myrtle Street and Front Street for the then proposed hotels. We are willing to similarly proceed with modification to the design of the office building to provide a clearly identifiable secondary secured entrance to the building, but (1) due to security concerns, (2) the minimal number of individuals who will actually access the building from Myrtle Street, and (3) its potential impact on the interior operation of the first floor tenant space, we must insist that this be a secured entrance to the building through the stairwell. We will propose design modifications similar to what we had proposed in DRH15-00339 to enhance the glazing at that point and provide some type of canopy element and return with a design at a later date.

Second, Site Specific Condition 1f requires “continuing the perforated metal panels to the ground level.” We agree with staff that this material does not pose the concerns that the prior material that had been proposed in DRH15-00339. However, we seek clarification of what is meant by “the ground level.” Along the perimeter of the first floor of the garage, we have proposed a masonry wall except for those areas designated for storefront glazing on the east and north faces. In those areas where we have proposed utilizing the metal panels, we would propose extending the metal panels down to the top of

the masonry wall or some distance above it to provide a reasonable gap. We believe that the metal panel and the masonry wall will work well to provide visual relief and are concerned about the long term maintenance of the panels if they were required to be brought all the way to the ground where they could be exposed to irrigation water, deicing materials, and other potentially impactful circumstances. We do not propose bringing the metal paneling to the ground level where storefront glazing has been proposed.

Third, the Staff Report recommends returning for a work session and then returning again when we are at a 60% design. The remaining issues identified in the Staff Report as conditions to be addressed are relatively straightforward. As such, we would propose merely returning when we are at a 60% design to the committee and foregoing a work session. We do not believe that a work session will be necessary as many of the landscaping and remaining issues are issues we previously addressed in DRH15-00339 and we know what is expected to satisfy these requirements.

We look forward to addressing these issues at the hearing on April 13, 2016 and will be prepared to address any further questions that the committee may have.

Sincerely,



Geoffrey M. Wardle
VP Development/General Counsel

GMW/cgt